UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,599	11/08/2006	Byeong Han Jang	3427-0139PUS1	4760
	7590 10/09/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747		FRIDIE JR, WILLMON		
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3722	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

1		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/539,599	JANG ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Willmon Fridie	3722
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Dominions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ded patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC a, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/19/ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	·
Dienosit	ion of Claims	and the second	,
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Applicat	ion Papers		
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document:  2. Certified copies of the priority document:  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in rity documents have bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage
Attachmen	ıt(s)		
1)  Notice 2)  Notice 3)  Inform	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application

.5

Application/Control Number: 10/539,599

Art Unit: 3722

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear as to the orientation and location of the main blade relative to the other recited elements.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4,6,11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Astrom ('311).

Astrom ('311) discloses (1) a milling cutter, comprising: a cutter body provided with a plurality of insert seats (8); and a cutting insert (9) having a hexahedral shape and inserted into and fastened to each of the insert seats in either of two directions, wherein

Application/Control Number: 10/539,599 Page 3

Art Unit: 3722

the cutting insert comprises: a through hole (10) formed in the cutting insert from an upper surface to a lower surface of the cutting insert; and first and second cutting blade parts (19,19') having the same shape and provided on first and second ends of the cutting insert, respectively, wherein the insert seats are radially formed inwards around a circumferential outer surface of the cutter body and are spaced apart from each other at regular intervals, and each of the insert seats comprises first and second locking holes respectively formed on first and second inner surfaces of the insert seat, so that the cutting insert is fastened to the insert seat by a locking screw which is tightened into the first or second locking hole of the insert seat after passing through the through hole of the cutting insert. With respect to claims 4 and 6, Astrom discloses rounded corner blades H1 and H2; and an inclined blade surface formed by the countersink (28)

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Application/Control Number: 10/539,599

Art Unit: 3722

Claims 5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Astrom ('311).

With respect to claim 5, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the main blades of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47. It appears that there would be no new or unexpected result from such a modification.

With respect to claims 7 and 8, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the cutting insert of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47. It appears that there would be no new or unexpected result from such a modification.

With respect to claim 9, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed ratio, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

In regard to claim 13, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the cutting insert balde with four edges, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device

Art Unit: 3722

involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8. It appears that there would be no new or unexpected result from such a modification.

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/19/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willmon Fridie whose telephone number is 571 272 4476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 10/539,599 Page 6

**Art Unit: 3722** 

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MONICA CARTER can be reached on 571 272 4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

\*wf

WILLMON FRIDIE, JR PRIMARY EXAMINED